

Appl. No. 10/728,875

REMARKS

Amendments to Specification

A new title is provided to replace the former title.

In addition, several minor editorial amendments have been made in the specification. The paragraph starting on p. 1, line 1, the paragraph starting on p. 10, line 27, the paragraph starting on p. 17, line 20 and the paragraph starting on p. 31, line 11 have been amended.

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 to 19, and 21 to 33 remain in the application. Claims 3, 4, 7 and 20 have been cancelled from the application.

Amendments to Claims

The Examiner has stated that claims 4 to 7, 9 to 14, 20 to 23 and 25 to 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

It appears that the Examiner has inadvertently incorrectly identified one of the claims being objected to. The Examiner indicated that claims 7 and 24 would be allowable, however based on the language of the claim cited in the objection, it appears the Examiner intended to indicate that claims 8 and 24 would be allowable. Therefore, Applicant has responded to Office Action based on Applicant's belief of the Examiner's intended objection as opposed to the Examiner's stated objection.

Applicant has amended the claims that were objected to by the Examiner by rewriting the claims in independent form in the manner suggested by the Examiner or by amending the claim dependencies so the objected to claims depend on allowable claims

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3 and 4. New claim 1 is therefore the subject matter of claim 4 rewritten in independent form including all the

Appl. No. 10/728,875

limitations of former claim 1 and intervening claim 3.

Claim 5 has been amended be dependent upon claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former claim 1.

Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former claim 1 and claim 7.

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 20. New claim 17 is therefore the subject matter of claim 20 rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of former claim 17.

Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former claim 17.

Claim 31 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former claim 17.

Original claims 9 to 14, 21, 22, 25 to 30, 32 and 33 are dependent upon claims or intervening claims that are now allowable.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 18 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner states that the expressions "the at least one payload sequence comprises a plurality of payload sequences" and "the at least one group of corresponding payload sequences comprises a plurality of groups of corresponding payload sequences" appear to be inherent from the disclosure of claim 1.

Applicant submits that claim 1 recites "at least one payload sequence" and "at least one group of corresponding payload sequences" which means that there are one or more of each respective sequence(s), whereas claim 2 recites "a plurality of...", which indicates more than one. As "more than one" is less than "one or more", the scope of claim 2 is indeed more limited than claim 1. The same argument applies to claim 18.

Appl. No. 10/728,875

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

35 U.S.C 102 Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 8, 15-17, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 6,222,830 (Padovani).

It appears that the Examiner intended to reject claim 7, not claim 8. Claim 7 has been cancelled. Furthermore, as indicated above claim 8 is intended to be allowable. Applicant has amended claim 8 by incorporating the limitations of former claim 1 and cancelled claim 7.

Another inadvertent error appears on page 4 of the Office Action, in which the Examiner states "With further regard to claim 16, Padovani teaches a processor with an inherent memory". Applicant believes the Examiner intended to state "With further regard to claim 17...", as claim 16 does not recite a processor, but claim 17 does recite a processor.

The rejections raised to claims 1, 3, 7, 15-17, 19 and 24 by the Examiner are rendered moot by the amendments to the claims detailed above.


It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection.

In view of the foregoing, early favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Maitland, Roger et al

By


Allan Brett
Reg. No. 40,476

Date: February 13, 2006

RAB:MSS:mcg